

## REMARKS

The Applicants have carefully reviewed the Final Office Action mailed June 13, 2007 and offer the following remarks.

Claims 1-6, 8, and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,496,867 B1 to *Beser et al.* (hereinafter "*Beser*"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

According to Chapter 2131 of the M.P.E.P., in order to anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102, "the reference must teach every element of the claim." The Applicants respectfully submit that *Beser* does not disclose each and every element recited in claims 1-6, 8, and 9. Accordingly, *Beser* cannot anticipate these claims. More specifically, claim 1 recites a method of forwarding a packet to a destination comprising, among other features, determining a private destination address and determining "a private address of a private remote sub-endpoint of a tunnel, said private sub-endpoint being associated with said private destination address." Claims 8 and 9 include similar features. The Applicants submit that *Beser* does not disclose the feature of determining two separate private addresses, a private destination address and a private address of a private remote sub-endpoint which is associated with the private destination address. In maintaining the rejection, the Patent Office states that *Beser* discloses this feature in column 22, lines 6-22.<sup>1</sup> The Applicants respectfully disagree. At most, *Beser* discloses that a first network device 14 receives a packet from an originating network device 24 destined for a terminating network device 26.<sup>2</sup> Upon receipt, the first network device 14 determines that a private network address associated with of the terminating network device 26 is associated with a public network address of a second network device 16.<sup>3</sup> Thus, *Beser* only discloses determining one private address. Nowhere does *Beser* disclose that, in addition to determining the private network address associated with the terminating network device 26, determining a private address of a private remote sub-endpoint which is associated with the private network address. Accordingly, claims 1, 8, and 9 are patentable over *Beser* and the Applicants request that the rejection be withdrawn. Similarly, claims 2-6 are patentable over *Beser* for at least the same reasons along with the novel features recited therein.

---

<sup>1</sup> See Final Office Action mailed June 13, 2007, pages 2 and 3.

<sup>2</sup> See *Beser*, col. 22, lines 8-13.

<sup>3</sup> See *Beser*, col. 22, lines 13-18.

The present application is now in a condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. The Examiner is encouraged to contact the Applicants' representative regarding any remaining issues in an effort to expedite allowance and issuance of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

WITHROW & TERRANOVA, P.L.L.C.

By:



Anthony J. Josephson  
Registration No. 45,742  
100 Regency Forest Drive, Suite 160  
Cary, NC 27518  
Telephone: (919) 238-2300

Date: August 3, 2007  
Attorney Docket: 7000-497